



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,443	07/25/2006	Tetsuya Nakamura	Q95749	1065
23373	7590	08/04/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			BASQUILL, SEAN M	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/597,443	NAKAMURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sean Basquill	1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction Requirement

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- Group I, claims 1-8 drawn to Compounds of Formula I;
- Group II, claims 9-17, and 19, drawn to pharmaceutical compositions containing a compound of Formula I and to a method of treating diseases mediated by adenosine A2 receptors using a compound of Formula I;
- Group III, Claim 18, drawn to a method of manufacturing a pharmaceutical composition containing a compound of Formula I;

As set forth in Rule 13.1 of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), "the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept." Moreover, as stated in PCT Rule 13.2, "where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application, the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features." Furthermore, Rule 13.2 defines "special technical features" as "those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art."

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of Group I is a compound of Formula I as put forward in Claim 1. The compound of Formula I of claim 1 does not present a contribution over the prior art. As disclosed in Hong Yang, *et al*, *Nanomolar Affinity Small Molecule Correctors of Defective deltaF508-CFTR Chloride Channel Gating*, 278 J. BIO. CHEM. 35079, 35083 (27 June 2003) (disclosing among others 3-benzamidobenzofuran-2-carboxamide), the compound of Formula I of instant claim 1 is anticipated. As such, Group I does not share a special technical feature with the instant claims of Groups II-III. Therefore, the claims are not so linked within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2 so as to form a single inventive concept, and unity between Groups I-III is broken.

Moreover, the invention associated with the compound of Formula I as claimed in Groups I-III delineated above, owing to the fact the amide and acetamide substituted benzofuran core is well-known in the art, lies in the identity of the various substituents placed thereon, particularly in the identity of substituent R². Because of the diverse nature of the substituents, all of the above-defined groups within this application contain claims directed to patentably distinct inventions (NOT species) as follows:

Each of the specifically claimed core compounds encompassed by Formula I, wherein R² is:

- An alkyl, haloalkyl, or cycloalkyl, group;
- An aryl, haloaryl, alkylaryl, or haloalkylaryl group;

- A heterocycle, halo or alkyl substituted heterocycle;
- A multicyclic fused ring system.

Within each of the above delineated groups, applicants are required to further define the nature and scope of the invention claimed by specifying the additional substituents, if any, which may be appended to the initial moiety to be bound to the art-recognized well known and common amide and acetamide substituted benzofuran core. This second layer substituent R2 should be selected from the following:

- An alkyl, haloalkyl, or cycloalkyl, group;
- An aryl, haloaryl, alkylaryl, or haloalkylaryl group;
- A heterocycle, halo or alkyl substituted heterocycle;
- A multicyclic fused ring system.

These lack unity of invention because the compounds have no substantial structural similarities although they have a common utility. *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300(CCPA 1980); *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). For example, a compound of Formula I, wherein R² is cyclopropyl is structurally distinct from a compound of Formula I, wherein R² is a substituted benzofuran, which is structurally distinct from a compound of Formula I wherein R² is a phenoxy pyridine, and so on.

Thus, Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the invention, e.g. selection of the identity of the substituent R², that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

In summary, applicant should elect ONE COMMON SUBSTITUENT R² from among the multitude presented in instant Claim 1 which more precisely defines the invention claimed therein.

2. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Group I is elected, the following species election is required:

- a. The precise compound of Formula I, with all substituents R^{1-6} defined.

If Group II is elected, the following species election is required:

- b. The precise compound of Formula I, with all substituents R^{1-6} defined.
- c. The specific disease to be treated.

If Group III is elected, the following species election is required:

- d. The precise compound of Formula I, with all substituents R^{1-6} defined.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically Applicant is required to define each of R^1-R^6 , and any additional variables as required for a particular species (a species for example is methyl, NOT alkyl). Upon Applicant's election of species, the result must provide a single chemical species and a single condition or disease to be treated or improved. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any

claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include

(i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and **(ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Basquill whose telephone number is (571) 270-5862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, between 8AM and 6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sean Basquill
Art Unit 1612

/Brandon J Fetterolf/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642